DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 696 EC 181 345

AUTHOR Hagerty, George J.; Abramson, Marty
TITLE Impediments to Proactive Policy Change for the Mildly Handicapped.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Policy; *Mild Disabilities; *Public Policy; Special Education; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

The paper examines the urgent need for timely action in the education of mildly handicapped students. Data are cited to show the rapid acceleration in identification of this population, principally those students identified as learning disabled. Fiscal concerns are explored, and the lack of recent data on expenditures across the range of special education service delivery models is noted. Research is reviewed which casts doubts on the adequacy of programs for mildly handicapped students and on the accuracy of evaluation and measurement procedures. The final section addresses obstacles to policy change in special education, including deficiencies in the existing database, the categorical nature of existing program and funding structures and of personnel preparation programs, and problems within the service delivery systems. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED264696

IMPEDIMENTS TO PROACTIVE POLICY CHANGE FOR THE MILDLY HANDICAPPED

Paper prepared for Session 3.40:
New Agendas for Special Education
AERA Annual Meeting

George J. Hagerty
Marty Abramson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George J. Hagerty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC181345

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985)

Introduction

For the American educational community, the 1980's have been a period of fervent re-examination. This national inquiry has certainly been an unrestricted enterprise, distinguished by the intensity of debate, the range of instructional and social/political issues addressed, and the universal composition of the groups currently attracted to the cause of quality schooling.

The fundamental propositions and the dimensions of the current debate regarding the status and direction of American education are incorporated in the spate of national reports and manifestoes generated by both public and private groups. Prominent among these discourses are Adler's The Paideia Proposal (1982), the National Commission on Excellence in Education's A National at Risk, The Twenthieth Century Fund's Making the Grade (1983), Goodlad's A Place Called School (1983) and the Education Commission of the State's Action for Excellence (1984).

Each of these documents confronts the existing educational system with its unequivocal shortcomings in academic content, instructional delivery, professional preparation, and methods of decision-making and governance. These reports are also charaterized by their clarion calls for extensive revisions in the way we educate future generations of citizens. While not

uniform in their presentation, each group charts a course for the reform of our nation's schools requiring collective commitment by the educational estalishment and the public. The importance of these reports to those interested in the education of handicapped children and youth is not so much the (oft remarked upon) absence of specific content and recommendations regarding the services provided to special students, but the fact that each of these documents realistically defines today's school as an environment of diversity which must attend more effectively to the unique needs of all of its inhabitants.

While the findings and recommendations originating from the majority of these reports are substantially oriented toward refinements in curriculum, instructional techniques and school management which are clearly designed to benefit and strengthen the provision of general education for a future of economic and scientific survival, the guidance offered by each group captures the similarities in need and remediation which coincidently exist within general education and special education. These include improvements in:

- the establishment of clear educational goals in the local, state and federal sectors,
- the level of measurable, meaningful student performance,
- the competence and training of current practitioners and new teachers,

- °the curricular content and instruction available to all students at all levels of education,
- °the accountability of school systems and the investment of the public in education, and
- °the management, leadership and fiscal support of educational systems.

That two quite independent systems exist, one "regular" and one "special", with their own patterns of funding, instruction and administration; with discrete professional jargon and affiliation; and with differing modes of personnel preparation further impairs the ability of the educational establishment to enact the cited reforms. Such a dual system perpetuates inefficiency and unnecessary competition in the delivery of educational services to all students (Algozzine, et.al., 1983; Hersh and Walker, 1983; Pugach and Lilly, 1984; Stainback and Stainback, 1984). This dichotomy in the structure of school systems poses a particular challenge to improving the education being provided to those children described as mildly handicapped.

It is to this group of "generically defined" students and their relationship with the educational environment that we turn our attention.

Perspectives on Problems Associated with Serving the Mildly Handicapped

The mildly handicapped are a hetergeneous group of students whose shared characteristic is their inability to fully benefit from the

existing regular education system. Traditionally, these students have been defined as learning disabled, educable mentally retarded, speech impaired and emotionally disturbed. As can be discerned from such categorical descriptions of these students, the mildly handicapped classification covers a population of students exhibiting an extensive range of learning, communication and/or socialization problems (Chalfant, 1984; Abramson, 1981; Stainback and Stainback, 1984).

Given that the severity of the deficits which these students possess is not sufficient to warrant a total immersion in the special education system, the mildly handicapped are frequently the charges of schooling's two instructional placements, regular education and special education. Despite an increasing volume of research on instructional effectiveness to the contrary (Hersh and Walker, 1983; Chalfant, 1984; Wang and Reynolds, 1984), the preferred method of educating mildly handicapped students is presently based on a "pull-out" strategy. In effect, for students to receive the services in "one system" they must be removed for a period of time from the "other system". This split-scheduling approach for providing services to handicapped children is neither administrately nor instructionally supportable when measured against legal requirements (U.S. Government, 1984), effective schools research (Hersh and Walker, 1983; Chalfant, 1984; and

Brophy, 1979) or fiscal considerations (Kakalik, 1981). Those researchers and educational decision-makers most intrigued with and involved in the conceptual mapping of our nation's schools are investigating the use of less restrictive mechanisms for serving mildly handicapped students, particularly models which allow for the total integration of mildly handicapped students in the regular classroom (Sontag, Hagerty and Button, 1983 and U.S. Department of Education, 1985).

The need for timely, if not immediate, action cannot be understated if we consider the data available to us:

Growth in the mildly handicapped population: While the total number of handicapped children served across the nation has increased slightly over the past several years (to 4,341,276 in 1983-84), there has been a rapid acceleration in the identification of children within the mildly handicapped population (predominantly in the learning disabled category). The child count for all handicapping conditions expanded a reasonable 632,688 students from 1976 to 1984. This increase can be attributed to national, state and local child find efforts and improvements in the availability of services to the overall handicapped population.

During this reporting period, however, the numbers for one of the mildly handicapped categories, learning disabilities (LD),

expanded by over 1,000,000 students. Since 1969, this population alone has grown from a small, rather clearly defined population of 120,000 to 797,213 in 1976, and to its present count of 1,811,489.

Despite moderate reductions in the numbers of children identified as mentally retarded (MR) and slight increases in the child count for the emotionally disturbed (ED) and speech impaired (SI) categories, the learning disabled count alone has assured that the generic "mildly handicapped" grouping has accounted for the greatest proportion of increase in the total child count over the past eight years (Gerber, 1984 and U.S. Department of Education 1984, 1985). That the growth in the numbers of children identified as LD has literally exploded can be highlighted by the fact that the percentage of all handicapped children classified as LD in California has grown from 22.4% in 1976-77 to 54.5% in 1982-83. In New York State, the percentage of change was similarly extraordinary, 14.4% in 1976-77 to 44.1% in 1982-83 (Gerber, 1984). In fact, national special education data shows that every year since school year 1977-78 the increase in the number of children identified as learning disabled has exceeded the yearly child count increase for all handicapping conditions (U.S. Department of Education, 1984).

Given that the U.S. Department of Education's Annual Report to Congress indicates (a) that the mildly handicapped comprise over

90% of the handicapped population and (b) that an extremely high percentage of these children receive service "mainly in the regular classroom" (e.g., LD (98%); SI, (100%), improvements in the instructional effectiveness found in regular education environments should logically yield significant benefits in the academic performance and socialization of mildly handicapped students.

Fiscal Concerns: As the mildly handicapped population expands in number and diversity, issues of the costs evolving from the identification, placement and specialized instruction process required for these students is gaining particular attention.

During the 1977-78 school year, the "added cost" of special education (i.e., those costs above the cost of regular education) was calculated to be $7 billion. With a 37 percent growth rate in national educational expenditures over the next year three years, the 1980-81 "added cost" was estimated to be over $10 billion (Kakalik, 1981). Although no current "added cost" calculations for 1983-84 are presently available, an extension of the Rand study's 1980-81 estimate would yield a projected expenditure of approximately $11.8 billion. This figure assumes that both the per pupil cost of regular education and special education increased by a moderate 5-7 percent over the past three years (U.S. Department of Education, 1984).

Based upon existing data, it is projected that in school year 1983-84, the total cost of providing instructional services to only two of the less "resource intensive" populations (i.e., LD and ED) exceeded $7.2 billion nationally (U.S. Department of Education, 1984).

While the nature and severity of a child's excpetionality must dictate the appropriate educational placement(s) and delivery of instructional and related services (GAO, 1981), the data elicited from the Rand study (Kakalik, 1981) reveals the cost-effectiveness of utilizing "less restrictive" or "increasingly integrated" instructional settings for serving the mildly handicapped.

See TABLE I

With the exception of isolated local and State level studies (GAO, 1981 and 1984), more recent data on expenditures across the range of special education service delivery models is not available. The U.S. Office of Special Education Programs has recently funded Decision Resources, Inc. of Washington, D.C. to conduct a comprehensive study of the financing of special education which should provide a detailed accounting of the way State and local education agencies support and deliver special education and related services to the existing categories of handicapped students.

Table I

CATEGORY	TYPE OF COST	REGULAR CLASS WITH INDIRECT SERVICE	REGULAR CLASS PLUS INTINERANT SPECIAL EDUCATOR	REGULAR CLASS PLUS PART-TIME SPECIAL CLASS	SPECIAL CLASS PLUS PART-TIME REGULAR CLASS	FULL TIME SPECIAL CLASS
		PLACEMENT				
Learning Disable	Total Cost	$2,552	$4,456	$4,714	$4,011	$4,432
	Added Cost	$ 902	$2,806	$3,064	$2,361	$2,782
Educable Mentally Retarded	Total Cost	$3,113	$3,884	$3,874	$4,058	$3,265
	Added Cost	$1,463	$2,234	$2,224	$2,408	$1,615
Emotionally Disturbed	Total Cost	$3,147	$7,946	$6,904	$5,417	$5,750
	Added Cost	$1,497	$6,296	$5,254	$3,767	$4,100
Speech Impaired	Total Cost	$2,477	$2,360	$4,025	$3,500	$5,439
	Added Cost	$ 827	$ 710	$2,375	$1,850	$3,789

SOURCE: Kakalik (Rand Study), 1981

Adequacy of Programs: Fiscal concern is heightened by the realization that differences in educational placement for mildly handicapped children are not necessarily indicative of differences in instruction (Pugach and Lilly, 1984; Stainback and Stainback, 1984; Sontag, Hagerty and Button, 1983). A recent Division H (AERA) Task Force on Special Education evaluation found that programs for mildly handicapped children did not differ substantively from compensatory education programs (Kennedy, 1982). More troubling are the findings of studies similar to the one conducted in Colorado investigating the identification and education system administered for children with perceptual-communicative disorders (PCD). This study reported that:

> On [the] average between 30% and 35% of the time [in PCD classrooms] is spent on repetition and drill on basic skills and between 15% and 18% of time is spent in one-to-one tutoring with regular classroom work. Therefore, roughly half of the special instructional time for PCD pupils is spent directly on academic work. (Shepard and Smith, 1981).

Of equal concern are the findings of educational effectiveness studies (Bloomer, Bates, Brown and Norlander, 1982; Glass, 1982) which raise compelling questions as to the benefits of current special education intervention strategies vis-a-vis the mildly handicapped. For example, in a study of children identified as learning disabled, Bloomer and colleagues found that 40% to 65% of the students (depending on subject matter) did not realize the expected benefits from special education.

Identification of the Population: Reviewing the history and development of the program administration and instructional interventions utilized for serving mildly handicapped students, it would appear as though regular education support systems have been supplanted by special education services. The creation of an alternative instructional environment for the placement of hard-to-teach students is a seductive notion indeed. Additionally, confusion over the appropriateness of regular versus special education interventions may well be attributable to the relative "softness" of such categories as learning disabled, educable mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed, and the difficulty in clearly distinguishing students with these impairments from traditionally "remedial populations", such as culturally deprived, economically disadvantaged, socially maladjusted (or just about any other category of hard-to-teach student). Certainly, the fears expressed in a 1981 General Accounting Office report, specifically related to the identification of the learning disabled population ring true today:

> Congressional fears that a disproportionate share of funds might be allocated to the learning disabilities category (the magnitude of which is not clearly known or understood) seems to have been realized with the lifting of the 2 percent cap on the number of learning disabled children who can be counted for Federal funding purposes. Little is known about who is being served in this category. These children may include those with mild learning problems, slow learners, and/or children who formerly would have been labeled retarded. (GAO, 1981).

The Colorado study of perceptual-communication disorders presents further damaging data to the notion that we currently have in place evaluation and measurement procedures which are sufficiently accurate to identify and categorize mildly handicapped students. The study concludes:

> The single most important finding is that more than half the children do not meet either statistical or valid clinical criteria for the identification of perceptual and communicative disorders (Shepard and Smith, 1981).

The problem of identifying specific categories of mildly handicapped children, e.g., the learning disabled, the emotionally disturbed, is further exacerbated by variations among States in terminology, definitions, and the establishment of criteria such as behavioral characteristics, test scores, capacity and achievement discrepencies and so forth (Chalfant, 1984; Shepard, 1984, Stainback and Stainback, 1984 and Lilly and Pugach, 1984). Although the Federal definitions for the various mildly handicapped categories are rather specific, the regulations are sufficiently flexible that State and local educational agencies continue to experience substantial difficulty in formulating operational definitions for any one of the categories.

It appears, then, that "what we have been about" in our effort to better serve students who fail to adequately benefit from the regular education system is to establish a paradigm for identifying and specially serving these hard-to-teach children.

This model has developed at a time in history where the collective forces of professional specialization, territorial (or targeted) funding, aggressive advocacy and legislated change have translated to the evolution of a special system for serving handicapped children which is quite independent and apart from regular education. However, it is undeniable that recent research on program administration and instruction has evidenced the need to explore and revise the methods by which we currently identify, place and serve handicapped children.

The calls for special education reform, for the re-integration and transfer of a large proportion of the mildly handicapped population into the domain of regular education, are parallelling public demands for improvement in teacher performance, educational accountability, academic standards and school environments. With our apparent national consensus for educational change, what can possibly stand in the way of reform? The answers may well be reflected in a Biblical addage which has immense applicability to public policy:" The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak."

The final section of this paper will explore selected issues to discover the obstacles to proactive policy change in serving the mildly handicapped. Such impediments, whether merely blemishes on the surface or more deeply rooted and insidious defects in the process of making and administering educational policy, must be addressed and overcome before meaningful, system-wide refinements occur in our schools.

Impediments to Policy Change in Special Education

In addressing the significant impediments to policy change in special education, the authors have taken the liberty to excise the term proactive. This owes not so much from cynicism at the thought of the term or the exclusion of the word from most reliable dictionaries, but it is stimulated by the recognition that policy development is the complex enterprise of assessing needs and responding to them. By nature, policy change is a reactive process triggered by programmatic and political forces (and hopefully supported by irrefutable data).

Changes in policy, be they revisions in statute, regulation, or in educational management or instructional systems, demand clearly articulated needs, corresponding goals and consistent direction (commonly referred to as leadership). Reforms in the basic structure of educational systems in this nation (and the policies which guide them) are not fully realized because overcoming the hurdles of data, support, continuous professional and public debate, and simple resistance to the notion of change appear to require more energy, resources and consensus than can be collectively committed by politicians, educators and the communities they serve. It is the desire of every educational planner to set forth, in advance, the obstacles to achieving a particular reform and to carefully prepare a sequenced plan of action for a logical, coordinated assault to overcome these

impediments. While such planning rarely takes into account all of the issues and interests which must be conquered for sucess, it is crucial for realizing any sort of public policy or systems change.

Time and purpose do not allow us to identify all of the impediments which may be strewn in the path of policy makers dedicated to reform the system by which we serve mildly handicapped children and youth. Nonetheless, the following items are important factors in planning for refinements in public policy.

Deficiencies in the Existing Data Base: Calls for changes in the service delivery system utilized for mildly handicapped students have been stimulated largely on the findings of social scientists (Glass, 1983; Lilly and Pugach, 1984; Gerber, 1984; Shepard, 1983; Stainback and Stainback, 1984; Wang and Reynolds, 1984). While data available at the federal and state levels serves the general needs of program administrators, legislative staffers, budget/finance officers and auditors, the information is specificially tailored for existing management needs. Ready access to aggregate and categorical child counts and fiscal data are the stuff of solid program administration and resource management. However, as an increasing number of studies have suggested, issues of instructional effectiveness, appropriateness

and availability are not dealt with comprehensively in either a national or State-wide data base.

In order to make clear decisions among numerous policy alternatives, educational decision-makers will require "future oriented" service delivery information; particularly data which addresses:

- °The duration and extensiveness of services,
- °The personnel utilized to provide various services and their professional preparation, and
- °The effects of instruction (i.e., comprehensive school exit data)

Existing Program and Funding Structures: Despite weaknesses in the measurement and identification processes utilized for special education, programming for special populations and the funding to support it has been almost exclusively categorical in nature (Shepard, 1983; Shepard and Smith, 1981, Stainback and Stainback, 1984; Wang and Reynolds, 1984; U.S. Department of Education, 1984 and 1985). Proposed efforts to gear special education funding to the instruction and related services actually needed or provided (versus the present per child allocation method) have been generally opposed by the special education establishment and advocacy groups because they ostensibly fear that consideration of a new "resource distribution" system could jeopordize a number of hard earned educational rights, including financial support, procedural safeguards and appropriate, individualized services. The natural instinct to "hold on to what has been won" serves as

as a major impediment to reforms which the educational community (including parents) recognize may be advantageous to improvement in services to a significant population of special students. Special education is especially prone to this "no change" reflex given the fact that it has been less than a decade since the passage of the Education of the Handicapped Act, and fresh memories of deregulation efforts.

Prudence must be the order of the day, if in fact, policy-makers determine that the existing system of categorical labels, funding and programming is not the most effective means of serving students presently identified as mildly handicapped.

> It should be stressed that it would be critical to move cautiously toward a reorganization of funding patterns. An initial step might be for federal and state agencies involved in the facilitation of research to earmark some support for studying funding options. A second step might be for federal and state agencies involved in funding service delivery to devise options on alternatives wherein a few states or school systems could submit plans to receive funding on an experimental basis, to meet the needs of all students, without the necessity of categorizing and labeling some students. Such plans should include monitoring and accountability procedures to assure that all students are, in fact, having their needs met. With such an approach, it would be possible to move toward a merger [of special and regular education], without the threat of radical reduction in funding and resources for students unserved on ill-served in the past (Stainback and Stainback, 1984).

Unfortunately, in several States, current regulation and practice inhibit full-time regular class integration for mildly handicapped students (Wang and Reynolds, 1984). Federal requirements regarding the placement and instruction in the least restrictive

environment (LRE) to the contrary, it appears that in these states the practice of establishing eligibility on the basis of handicapped labels is further exacerbated by the use of a stringent categorical model for determining eligible (i.e., fundable) special education services. In one state, for example, eligible services for handicapped children included related services, transitional support services, resource rooms, special classes and schools, and home instruction, but did not allow for the support of full time specialized instruction provided by the regular classroom teacher (Wang and Reynolds, 1984). Fears of the over identification of hard-to-teach students as mildly handicapped have precipitated a host of frequently regressive administrative, diagnostic and programmatic controls. Concern about a future of spiraling special education costs have been met with renewed calls for containment remedies such as funding and child count caps for certain categories of handicapped students and revising identification and special education placement criteria. In truth, these efforts have proven only to solve the immediate administrative problems of reducing child counts in certain categories. Such restrictive measures (e.g., categorical capping) do not remediate or lead to the resolution of the problem of improving the instruction available to the significant underclass of hard-to-teach children with learning, communication and/or socialization deficits.

Preparation of Personnel: The vast majority of programs training personnel to serve in our nation's schools are categorical in nature (Pugach and Lilly, 1984; Stainback and Stainback, 1984). This categorical preparation is influenced by (and frequently influences) the categorical models which most States maintain for purposes of certification. Although the existing systems of personnel preparation have already received considerable attention in the papers developed by other presenters, it is important to address several critical issues relevant to the educational change process.

A significant factor in determining effective versus the less effective school environment is the level of staff interaction.

> Four classes of interaction appear crucial [in successful schools]: discussion of classroom practice, mutual observation and critique, shared efforts to design and prepare curriculum, and shared participation in the business of instructional improvement (Little, 1982).

The basics of collegiality rehearsed above serve as the foundations for effective instruction. The existing regular education/special education dichotomy imposes restrictions on the level of interaction which can logically be realized in our schools. Unfortunately, the separate instructional systems currently in place are perpetuated not only by administrative convenience, but by a system of professional prepartion and certification which further institutionalizes program and staff segregation.

Reforms toward more integrated classroom models for serving mildly handicapped children and youth must be parallelled (if not preceded) by changes in the structure of training programs and certification requirements. Such revisions will demand the cooperation and collective energies of college and university personnel, State and local educational agencies, legislators and advocates. Efforts to implement comprehensive systems of personnel development (CSPD) to ensure the effective implementation of new regular classroom interventions for mildly handicapped students will demand that States direct increasing attention to: (a) the traditional regular education community (i.e., principals, general education teachers), and (b) a new cadre of specially trained regular educators.

Of course, revisions in the structure of colleges and departments of education, as well as refinements in State certification requirements, will not be undertaken without corresponding changes in legislation, prevailing instructional models and professional/ programmatic incentives. For example, it is unthinkables that universities will commence a wholesale restructuring of their teacher education programs (i.e., from categorical to unified preparation) without significant modifications in general certification standards, and changes in the distribution and targeting of Federal and State training funds. However, challenges to the categorical status-quo for preparing teachers and

related service providers must ensure that the unique needs of severely handicapped populations are recognized and addressed. In essence, efforts to improve services for mildly handicapped students should in no way jeopardize the educational rights, protections and special education programs which have benefitted the most severely involved children and youth.

The Service Delivery System: We conclude the paper by examining several of the fundamental barriers to policy change which are found in the extant service delivery system for mildly handicapped students. As noted, the identification, placement and instructional system in which the mildly handicapped population is served is in reality a dual system. In attempting to cull out those students who possess "handicaps" (for special education) from students who exhibit learning problems (for placement in regular education), state and local education agencies have invested considerable time, funds and energy into establishing intricate assessment models, criteria for identification, and standards for placement and instruction.

The components of a legally and administratively compliant service delivery system are now substantially in place in the 16,000 local educational agencies and intermediate units across the country (U.S. Department of Education, 1984, 1985). Moves toward the

reform of the existing educational system to more efficiently serve the mildly handicapped and hard-to-teach populations will undoubtedly meet considerable local resistence. This reaction will not result from any ill-feelings toward students with learning problems, but will be the natural response of educators, parents, advocates and bureacrats to the seeming onslaught of everchanging policies, directives and standards emanating from on high. Revisions in the structure of the current educational system will undoubtedly create initial anxiety, confusion and dysfunction as educators wrestle with the inherent administrative and instructional problems associated with developing and operating a reformed (i.e., merged) program for serving children now labeled as mildly handicapped.

While the flaws in the existing system are readily apparent to local educational agencies (LEAs), designs for change in the educational structure must be contemplated and implemented in a way that creates a "receptive spirit" among those who are in the trenches on a daily basis. While calls for a change in the system by which we educate mildly handicapped students are filtering up from the local level to State and Federal decision-makers, those who actually provide the services are wary of "reform" since they recognize that the rules by which funds are distributed and programs administered have been traditionally (i.e., since the 1960's) in the hands of legislators and bureaucrats at the State and Federal levels.

Despite an increasing emphasis at the Federal and State level on local control of educational decision-making and programming, LEA administrators, practitioners and board members will undoubtedly be circumspect of calls for change. Correct or not, the perceptions and memories of local personnel have been molded by the battle scars of attempts to meet the standards of legislated initiatives with inadequate preparation and resources.

Evoking the active support and participation of the "grassroots" populations (e.g., LEA personnel, advocates, parents) for any reform of national scope will realistically demand a coordinated effort by educational officials (from all levels), legislators, advocates, related service professionals, teacher educators, material developers and book publishers (among others) to clearly define deficiencies and needs and to collectively establish a logical agenda and reasonable timetable for change.

References

Abramson, M., et. al., Parent's Perceptions of Their Learning Disabled Child's Educational Performance, Learning Disability Quarterly, 6 (2), 1983.

Algozzine, R., Salvia, J. and Ysseldyke, E., Who Should Teach the Difficult to Teach Students?, Educators Forum, 1983.

Chalfant, J., Identifying Learning Disabled Students: Guidelines for Decision Making, Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), Burlington, Vermont, 1984.

Coles, G.S., The Learning Disabilities Test Battery: Empirical and Social Issues, Harvard Education Review, Vol. 48, No. 3, August 1978.

Glass, G., Effectiveness of Special Education, Policy Studies Review, Vol. 2, Special No. 1, January, 1983.

General Accounting Office, Disparities Still Exist in Who Gets Special Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1981.

Gerber, M., Is Congress Getting the Full Story?, Exceptional Children, Vol. 51, No. 3, November, 1984.

Hagerty, G., Behrens, T., and Abramson, M., Fostering an Agenda of Shared Responsibility in Teacher Education, in Sharp (Ed.), Challenge and Change in Teacher Education, AACTE Publications, 1983.

Hersh, R. and Walker, H., Great Expectations: Making Schools Effective for All Students, Policy Studies Review, Vol. 2, Special #1, January, 1983.

Howe, C., Keele, L., Responsibility for the Mildly Handicapped: A Proposal for Change, The Executive Review, Vol. 2, No. 6, March, 1982.

Kakalik, J.S., Furry W. et. al., The Cost of Special Education, The Rand Corporation, Contract No. 300-79-0733 (USDE), 1981.

Kennedy, M., Report of the Division H Task Force on Special Education Evaluation, American Educational Research Association, March, 1982.

Little, J.W., Collegiality and Improvement Norms: The School as Workplace, American Educational Research Journal XIX, Fall, 1982.

Pugach, M. and Lilly, M.S., Reconceptualizing Support Services for Classroom Teachers: Implications for Teacher Education, Journal of Teacher Education, 35(5), 1984.

Rosenholtz, S., Political Myths About Education Reform: Lessons from Research on Teaching, Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1985.

Shepard, L., The Role of Measurement in Educational Policy: Lessons from the Identification of Learning Disabilities, Educational Measurement: Issue and Practice, Fall, 1983.

Shepard, L., and Smith, M., Evaluation of the Identification of Perceptual-Communication Disorders in Colorado (Final Report), University of Colorado, February 20, 1981.

Sontag, E., Hagerty, G. and Button, J., Perspectives on the Status and Future of Special Education and Regular Education, in Reynolds (Ed.) The Future of Mainstreaming, AACTE Publications, 1982.

Stainback, W. and Stainback, S., A Rationale for the Merger of Special and Regular Education, Exceptional Children, Vol. 51, No. 2, 1984.

U.S. Department of Education, 1984 Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1984.

U.S. Department of Education, 1985 Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1985.

U.S. Commission on Excellence, A Nation at Risk, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

U.S. Government, Code of Federal Regulations: Parts 300 to 399, Revised as of July, 1984, U.S. Government Printing Officer, Washington, D.C., 1984.

Wang, M. and Reynolds, M., Avoiding the "Catch 22" in Special Education Reform, unpublished paper, 1984.